

MODELS OF NEUTRINO MASS AND INTERACTIONS FOR NEUTRINO OSCILLATIONS

ERNEST MA

*Department of Physics, University of California
Riverside, CA 92521, USA*

I review the various mechanisms for obtaining nonzero neutrino masses. I focus on the possibility of adding one light singlet neutrino to the three known doublet neutrinos ν_e , ν_μ , and ν_τ to accommodate the totality of neutrino-oscillation experiments. I review the various theoretical suggestions for this singlet. I discuss also a scenario in which there are only the three doublet neutrinos but a large anomalous interaction is assumed for ν_τ as an attempt to explain all present data.

1 Neutrino Masses

In the minimal standard model, under the gauge group $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$, the leptons transform as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \nu_e \\ e \end{bmatrix}_L, \begin{bmatrix} \nu_\mu \\ \mu \end{bmatrix}_L, \begin{bmatrix} \nu_\tau \\ \tau \end{bmatrix}_L \sim (1, 2, -1/2); \quad e_R, \mu_R, \tau_R \sim (1, 1, -1). \quad (1)$$

There is also the Higgs scalar doublet $(\phi^+, \phi^0) \sim (1, 2, 1/2)$ whose nonzero vacuum expectation value $\langle \phi^0 \rangle = v$ breaks $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ to $U(1)_Q$. Whereas charged leptons acquire masses proportional to v , the absence of ν_R implies that $m_{\nu_i} = 0$. If nonzero neutrino masses are desired (which are of course necessary for neutrino oscillations), then we must ask “What is the nature of this mass?” and “What new physics goes with it?”

If ν_R does not exist, one way to have $m_\nu \neq 0$ is to add a Higgs triplet (ξ^{++}, ξ^+, ξ^0) . Each ν_L then gets a Majorana mass. However, $\langle \xi^0 \rangle$ must be very small, and if the lepton number being carried by ξ is spontaneously violated¹, the decay of Z to the associated massless Goldstone boson (the triplet Majoron) and its partner would count as two extra neutrinos. Since the effective number of light neutrinos in Z decay is now measured² to be 2.989 ± 0.012 , the triplet Majoron model is clearly ruled out.

If one $\nu_R \sim (1, 1, 0)$ exists for each ν_L , the most general 2×2 neutrino mass matrix linking $(\bar{\nu}_L, \bar{\nu}_R^c)$ to (ν_L^c, ν_R) is given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{bmatrix} m_L & m_D \\ m_D & m_R \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

If $m_L = 0$ and $m_D \ll m_R$, we get the famous seesaw mechanism³

$$m_\nu \sim \frac{m_D^2}{m_R}. \quad (3)$$

Here, $\nu_L - \nu_R^c$ mixing is m_D/m_R and m_R is the scale of new physics. In this minimal scenario, new physics enters only through m_R , hence there is no other observable effect except for a nonzero m_ν . Actually, m_D/m_R is in principle observable but it is in practice far too small.

In general, the mass matrix of Eq. (2) yields two nondegenerate interacting Majorana neutrinos (unless $m_L = m_R = 0$ is maintained exactly). If both eigenvalues are small, the effective number of neutrinos counted in Big Bang Nucleosynthesis may be as high as six, instead of the usual three, depending on the mass splitting and mixing in each case⁴.

The smallness of neutrino masses may be indicative of their radiative origin. Many papers have been written on the subject. For a brief review, see Ref. 5. There are three one-loop mechanisms: the exchange of two scalar bosons with one fermion mass insertion; the exchange of one scalar boson with three fermion mass insertions; and the coupling to a scalar boson which gets a radiative vacuum expectation value through a fermion loop with five mass insertions. A prime example of the first mechanism is the Zee model⁶. Here the minimal standard model is extended to include a charged scalar singlet χ^+ and a second scalar doublet (η^+, η^0) . We then have the coupling

$$f_{ij}\chi^+(\nu_i l_j - l_i \nu_j), \quad (4)$$

which by itself would require χ^+ to have lepton number -2 . However, this model also allows the cubic scalar coupling

$$\chi^-(\phi^+\eta^0 - \phi^0\eta^+), \quad (5)$$

hence lepton number is broken explicitly. A radiative Majorana mass matrix is thus obtained through the exchange and mixing of χ^+ and the physical linear combination of ϕ^+ and η^+ . Since f_{ij} of Eq. (4) is zero for $i = j$ and ϕ^+ couples ν_i to l_i with strength proportional to m_{l_i} which is also the one fermion mass insertion required, the 3×3 neutrino mass matrix for ν_e , ν_μ and ν_τ is of the form

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu \propto \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & f_{e\tau}m_\tau^2 \\ 0 & 0 & f_{\mu\tau}m_\tau^2 \\ f_{e\tau}m_\tau^2 & f_{\mu\tau}m_\tau^2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(m_\mu^2). \quad (6)$$

This means that ν_τ is almost degenerate with a linear combination of ν_μ and ν_e in this model. This may have a practical application in present neutrino-oscillation phenomenology⁷.

There are also three two-loop mechanisms: the exchange of three scalar bosons which are tied together by a cubic coupling; the exchange of two W bosons; and the exchange of W_L and W_R which mix at the one-loop level. The second mechanism⁸ is unique in that it requires only one additional ν_R beyond the standard model. In this specific case, one ν_L gets a seesaw mass and the other two get two-loop masses proportional to this mass and as functions of the charged-lepton masses with double GIM suppression⁹. A detailed analytical and numerical study of this mechanism has been made¹⁰.

Finally let me return to the triplet-Higgs mechanism. If lepton number is violated explicitly by the coupling of ξ to the scalar doublet ϕ , then one may let ξ be very heavy and integrate it out to obtain the following effective nonrenormalizable interaction:

$$\frac{1}{M}[\phi^0\phi^0\nu_i\nu_j + \phi^+\phi^0(\nu_i l_j + l_i\nu_j) + \phi^+\phi^+l_i l_j] + h.c. \quad (7)$$

For $M \sim 10^{13}$ GeV, one gets $m_\nu \sim \text{few eV}$. This is the most economical solution and could also be a realistic model of leptogenesis¹¹ in the early universe which gets converted at the electroweak phase transition into the present observed baryon asymmetry.

2 Neutrino Oscillations

Present experimental evidence for neutrino oscillations¹² includes the solar ν_e deficit which requires Δm^2 of around 10^{-5} eV² for the MSW explanation or 10^{-10} eV² for the vacuum-oscillation solution, the atmospheric neutrino deficit in the ratio $\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu/\nu_e + \bar{\nu}_e$ which implies a Δm^2 of around 10^{-2} eV², and the LSND experiment which indicates a Δm^2 of around 1 eV². Three different Δm^2 necessitate four neutrinos, but the invisible width of the Z boson as well as Big Bang Nucleosynthesis allow only three. If all of the above-mentioned experiments are interpreted correctly as due to neutrino oscillations, we are faced with a theoretical challenge in trying to understand how three can equal four. I will focus on addressing this issue rather than trying to review the many theoretical models for the three known neutrinos.

3 Three Neutrinos and One Light Singlet

One possibility is that there is a light singlet neutrino ν_S in addition to the three known doublet neutrinos ν_e , ν_μ , and ν_τ . This is necessary so that it is not counted in the effective number of neutrinos in Z decay². On the other hand, it has to mix with the doublet neutrinos for it to be relevant to oscillation experiments. Hence it is also constrained⁴ by Big Bang Nucleosynthesis. Using

all available data, a model-independent analysis¹³ shows that the 4×4 neutrino mass matrix must separate approximately into two blocks: one for $\nu_e - \nu_S$ and the other for $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$, the latter with large mixing.

An example of a specific model of this kind already exists¹⁴. The neutrino interaction eigenstates are related to the mass eigenstates by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \nu_S \\ \nu_e \\ \nu_\mu \\ \nu_\tau \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -s & c & s''/\sqrt{2} & s''/\sqrt{2} \\ c & s & -s'/\sqrt{2} & s'/\sqrt{2} \\ -s' & 0 & -1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} \\ 0 & -s'' & 1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \nu_1 \\ \nu_2 \\ \nu_3 \\ \nu_4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where $m_1 = 0$, $m_2 \sim 2.5 \times 10^{-3}$ eV, $m_3 \sim m_4 \sim 2.5$ eV, with $\Delta m_{34}^2 \sim 1.8 \times 10^{-2}$ eV²; $s \sim s' \sim 0.04$, but s'' is undetermined. Note that $m_{\nu_e} < m_{\nu_S}$ is necessary for the MSW solution¹⁵ of the solar neutrino deficit. Note also that ν_μ and ν_τ are pseudo-Dirac partners, hence the mixing angle for atmospheric neutrino oscillations is 45 degrees.

What is the nature of this light singlet? and how does it mix with the usual neutrinos? There have been some discussions on these questions in the past two or three years. One idea¹⁶ is that it is the fermion partner of the massless Goldstone boson of a spontaneously broken global symmetry, such as lepton number (hence a Majorino) in supersymmetry. Another¹⁷ is that it is the fermion partner of a scalar field corresponding to a flat direction (hence a modulino) in the supersymmetric Higgs potential. If the standard model is extended to include a mirror $[SU(2) \times U(1)]'$ sector, then ν_S may be identified as a mirror neutrino, either in a theory where the mirror symmetry is broken¹⁸ or one where it is exact¹⁹. In the latter case, maximal mixing between the three known neutrinos and their mirror counterparts would occur and Big Bang Nucleosynthesis would count six neutrinos under normal conditions.

Both questions can be answered naturally in a model²⁰ based on E_6 inspired by superstring theory. In the fundamental **27** representation of E_6 , outside the 15 fields belonging to the minimal standard model, there are 2 neutral singlets. One (N) is identifiable with the right-handed neutrino because it is a member of the **16** representation of $SO(10)$; the other (S) is a singlet also under $SO(10)$. In the reduction of E_6 to $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$, an extra $U(1)$ gauge factor may survive down to the TeV energy scale. It could be chosen such that N is trivial under it, but S is not. This means that N is allowed to have a large Majorana mass so that the usual seesaw mechanism works for the three doublet neutrinos. At the same time, S is protected from having a mass by the extra $U(1)$ gauge symmetry, which I call $U(1)_N$. However, it does acquire a small mass from an analog of the usual seesaw mechanism because it can couple to doublet neutral fermions which are present in the **27** of E_6 .

outside the **16** of $SO(10)$. Renaming S as ν_S , the 3×3 mass matrix spanning ν_S , ν_E , and N_E^c is given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & m_1 & m_2 \\ m_1 & 0 & m_E \\ m_2 & m_E & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

Hence $m_{\nu_S} \sim 2m_1m_2/m_E$, which is a singlet-doublet seesaw rather than the usual doublet-singlet seesaw. Furthermore, the mixing of ν_S with the doublet neutrinos is also possible through these extra doublet neutral fermions. The spontaneous breaking of $U(1)_N$ is not possible without also breaking the supersymmetry, hence both are assumed to occur at the TeV energy scale, resulting in a rich Z' and Higgs phenomenology²¹.

4 Three Neutrinos and One Anomalous Interaction

If one insists on keeping only the usual three neutrinos and yet try to accommodate all present data, how far can one go? It has been pointed out by many authors²² that both solar and LSND data can be explained, as well as most of the atmospheric data except for the zenith-angle dependence. It is thus worthwhile to consider the following scenario²³ whereby a possible anomalously large ν_τ -quark interaction may mimic the observed zenith-angle dependence of the atmospheric data. Consider first the following approximate mass eigenstates:

$$\nu_1 \sim \nu_e \quad \text{with } m_1 \sim 0, \quad (10)$$

$$\nu_2 \sim c_0\nu_\mu + s_0\nu_\tau \quad \text{with } m_2 \sim 10^{-2} \text{ eV}, \quad (11)$$

$$\nu_3 \sim -s_0\nu_\mu + c_0\nu_\tau \quad \text{with } m_3 \sim 0.5 \text{ eV}, \quad (12)$$

where $c_0 \equiv \cos\theta_0$, $s_0 \equiv \sin\theta_0$, and θ_0 is not small. Allow ν_1 to mix with ν_3 with a small angle θ' and the new ν_1 to mix with ν_2 with a small angle θ , then the LSND data can be explained with $\Delta m^2 \sim 0.25 \text{ eV}^2$ and $2s_0s'c' \sim 0.19$ and the solar data can be understood as follows.

Consider the basis ν_e and $\nu_\alpha \equiv c_0\nu_\mu + s_0\nu_\tau$. Then

$$-i\frac{d}{dt}|\nu\rangle_{e,\alpha} = \left(p + \frac{\mathcal{M}^2}{2p}\right)|\nu\rangle_{e,\alpha}, \quad (13)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}^2 = \mathcal{U} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_2^2 \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}^\dagger + \begin{bmatrix} A+B & 0 \\ 0 & B+C \end{bmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

In the above, A comes from the charged-current interaction of ν_e with e , B from the neutral-current interaction of ν_e and ν_α with the quarks and electrons, and C from the assumed anomalous ν_τ -quark interaction. Let

$$\mathcal{U} = \begin{pmatrix} c & s \\ -s & c \end{pmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

then the resonance condition is

$$m_2^2 \cos 2\theta - A + C = 0, \quad (16)$$

where²⁴

$$A - C = 2\sqrt{2}G_F(N_e - s_0^2\epsilon'_q N_q)p. \quad (17)$$

In order to have a large ϵ'_q and yet satisfy the resonance condition for solar-neutrino flavor conversion, m_2 should be larger than its canonical value of 2.5×10^{-3} eV, and ϵ'_q should be negative. [If ϵ'_q comes from R -parity violating squark exchange, then it must be positive, in which case an inverted mass hierarchy, *i.e.* $m_2 < m_1$ would be needed. If it comes from vector exchange, it may be of either sign.] Assuming as a crude approximation that $N_q \simeq 4N_e$ in the sun, the usual MSW solution with $\Delta m^2 = 6 \times 10^{-6}$ eV² is reproduced here with

$$s_0^2\epsilon'_q \simeq -3.92 = -4.17(m_2^2/10^{-4}\text{eV}^2) + 0.25. \quad (18)$$

The seemingly arbitrary choice of $\Delta m_{21}^2 \sim 10^{-4}$ eV² is now seen as a reasonable value so that ϵ'_q can be large enough to be relevant for the following discussion on the atmospheric neutrino data.

Atmospheric neutrino oscillations occur between ν_μ and ν_τ in this model with $\Delta m_{32}^2 \sim 0.25$ eV², the same as for the LSND data, but now it is large relative to the E/L ratio of the experiment, hence the factor $\cos \Delta m^2(L/2E)$ washes out and

$$P_0(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sin^2 2\theta_0 \simeq 0.66 \quad \text{for } s_0 \simeq 0.47. \quad (19)$$

In the standard model, this would hold for all zenith angles. Hence it cannot explain the present experimental evidence that the depletion is more severe for neutrinos coming upward to the detector through the earth than for neutrinos coming downward through only the atmosphere. This zenith-angle dependence appears also mostly in the multi-GeV data and not in the sub-GeV data. It is this trend which determines Δm^2 to be around 10^{-2} eV² in this case. As shown below, the hypothesis that ν_τ has anomalously large interactions with quarks will mimic this zenith-angle dependence even though Δm^2 is chosen to be much larger, *i.e.* 0.25 eV².

Consider the basis ν_μ and ν_τ . Then the analog of Eq. (13) holds with Eq. (14) replaced by

$$\mathcal{M}^2 = \mathcal{U}_0 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_3^2 \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}_0^\dagger + \begin{bmatrix} B & 0 \\ 0 & B + C \end{bmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

The resonance condition is then

$$m_3^2 \cos 2\theta_0 + C = 0, \quad (21)$$

where N_q in C now refers to the quark number density inside the earth and the factor s_0^2 in Eq. (17) is not there. If C is large enough, the probability P_0 would not be the same as the one in matter. Using the estimate $N_q \sim 9 \times 10^{30} \text{ m}^{-3}$ and defining

$$X \equiv \epsilon'_q E_\nu / (10 \text{ GeV}), \quad (22)$$

the effective mixing angles in matter are given by

$$\tan 2\theta_m^E = \frac{\sin 2\theta_0}{\cos 2\theta_0 + 0.091X} \quad \text{for } \nu, \quad (23)$$

$$\tan 2\bar{\theta}_m^E = \frac{\sin 2\theta_0}{\cos 2\theta_0 - 0.091X} \quad \text{for } \bar{\nu}. \quad (24)$$

For sub-GeV neutrinos, X is small so matter effects are not very important. For multi-GeV neutrinos, X may be large enough to satisfy the resonance condition of Eq. (21). Assuming adiabaticity, the neutrino and antineutrino survival probabilities are given by

$$P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos 2\theta_0 \cos 2\theta_m^E), \quad (25)$$

$$\bar{P}(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos 2\theta_0 \cos 2\bar{\theta}_m^E). \quad (26)$$

Since $\sigma_\nu \simeq 3\sigma_{\bar{\nu}}$, the observed ratio of $\nu + \bar{\nu}$ events is then

$$P_m \simeq \frac{3rP + \bar{P}}{3r + 1}, \quad (27)$$

where r is the ratio of the ν_μ to $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ flux in the upper atmosphere. The atmospheric data are then interpreted as follows. For neutrinos coming down through only the atmosphere, $P_0 = 0.66$ applies. For neutrinos coming up through the earth, $P_m \simeq P_0 \simeq 0.66$ as well for the sub-GeV data. However, for the multi-GeV data, if $X = -15$, then $P = 0.31$ and $\bar{P} = 0.76$, hence P_m is lowered to 0.39 if $r = 1.5$ or 0.42 if $r = 1.0$. The apparent zenith-angle dependence of the data may be explained.

5 Conclusion and Outlook

If all present experimental indications of neutrino oscillations turn out to be correct, then either there is at least one sterile neutrino beyond the usual ν_e , ν_μ , and ν_τ , or there is an anomalously large ν_τ -quark interaction. The latter can be tested at the forthcoming Sudbury Neutrino Observatory (SNO) which has the capability of neutral-current detection. The predicted Δm^2 of 0.25 eV² in ν_μ to ν_e and ν_τ oscillations will also be tested at the long-baseline neutrino experiments such as Fermilab to Soudan 2 (MINOS), KEK to Super-Kamiokande (K2K), and CERN to Gran Sasso.

More immediately, the new data from Super-Kamiokande, Soudan 2, and MACRO on $\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu$ events through the earth should be analyzed for such an effect. For a zenith angle near zero, the $\Delta m^2 \sim 10^{-2}$ eV² oscillation scenario should have $R \sim 1$, whereas the $\Delta m^2 \sim 0.25$ eV² oscillation scenario (with anomalous interaction) would have $R = P_0 \sim 0.66$. Furthermore, if ν and $\bar{\nu}$ can be distinguished (as proposed in the HANUL experiment), then to the extent that CP is conserved, matter effects can be isolated.

Neutrino physics is on the verge of major breakthroughs. New experiments in the next several years will be decisive in leading us forward in its theoretical understanding, and may even discover radically new physics beyond the standard model.

Acknowledgments

I thank Biswarup Mukhopadhyaya and all the other organizers for their great hospitality and a stimulating workshop. This work was supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG03-94ER40837.

References

1. G. B. Gelmini and M. Roncadelli, Phys. Lett. **99B**, 411 (1981).
2. P. B. Renton, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A12**, 4109 (1997).
3. M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, and R. Slansky, in *Supergravity, Proc. of the Workshop*, Stony Brook, New York, 1979, eds. P. Van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Z. Freedman (North-Holland, 1979), p. 315; T. Yanagida, in *Proc. of the Workshop on the Unified Theory and the Baryon Number in the Universe*, Tsukuba, Japan, 1979, eds. O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto (KEK Report No. 79-18, Tsukuba, Japan, 1979).
4. K. Enqvist *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B373**, 498 (1992); X. Shi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 2563 (1993).
5. K. S. Babu and E. Ma, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A4**, 1975 (1989).

6. A. Zee, Phys. Lett. **93B**, 389 (1980).
7. A. Yu. Smirnov and M. Tanimoto, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 1665 (1997).
8. K. S. Babu and E. Ma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 674 (1988); Phys. Lett. **B228**, 508 (1989). See also S. T. Petcov and S. T. Toshev, Phys. Lett. **B143**, 175 (1984).
9. S. L. Glashow, J. Iliopoulos, and L. Maiani, Phys. Rev. **D2**, 1285 (1970).
10. D. Choudhury, R. Gandhi, J. A. Gracey, and B. Mukhopadhyaya, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 3468 (1994).
11. E. Ma and U. Sarkar, UCRHEP-T204 (in preparation).
12. For an updated review, see the talks by S. Pakvasa and by P. Pal in these Proceedings.
13. N. Okada and O. Yasuda, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A12**, 3669 (1997); S. M. Bilenky, C. Giunti, and W. Grimus, Eur. Phys. J. **C1**, 247 (1998).
14. E. Ma and P. Roy, Phys. Rev. **D52**, R4780 (1995).
15. S. P. Mikheyev and A. Yu. Smirnov, Yad. Fiz. **42**, 1441 (1985) [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **42**, 913 (1985)]; Nuovo Cim. **C9**, 17 (1986); L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. **D17**, 2369 (1978); **20**, 2634 (1979).
16. E. J. Chun, A. S. Joshipura, and A. Yu. Smirnov, Phys. Lett. **B357**, 608 (1995); Phys. Rev. **D54**, 4654 (1996).
17. K. Benakli and A. Yu. Smirnov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 4314 (1997).
18. Z. G. Berezhiani and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 6607 (1995).
19. R. Foot and R. R. Volkas, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 6595 (1995).
20. E. Ma, Phys. Lett. **B380**, 286 (1996); E. Keith and E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 3587 (1996).
21. E. Keith, E. Ma, and B. Mukhopadhyaya, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 3111 (1997).
22. C. Y. Cardall and G. M. Fuller, Phys. Rev. **D53**, 4421 (1996). See also the earlier work of S. M. Bilenky, A. Bottino, C. Giunti, and C. W. Kim, Phys. Lett. **B356**, 273 (1995); K. S. Babu, J. C. Pati, and F. Wilczek, *ibid.*, **B359**, 351 (1995); G. L. Fogli, E. Lisi, and G. Scioscia, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 5334 (1995).
23. E. Ma and P. Roy, UCRHEP-T186 (September, 1997).
24. M. M. Guzzo, A. Masiero, and S. T. Petcov, Phys. Lett. **B260**, 154 (1991); E. Roulet, Phys. Rev. **D44**, R935 (1991); V. Barger, R. J. N. Phillips, and K. Whisnant, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 1629 (1991); P. I. Krastev and J. N. Bahcall, hep-ph/9703267.